

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 31 August 2000 with twenty three claims, three of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

The specification was objected to for incorporating by reference a patent application which has since issued. The specification has been amended to properly reference the patent.

Claim 2 was objected to for including the word "represents." Claim 2 has been amended to clarify what is being claimed.

Claims 5 and 12-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated, "Claim 5 recites the limitations 'storing,' 'communicating' 'adjusting' steps in lines 2, 4 and 6, respectively. There is insufficient information to determine whether the steps are performed in the processing units or the controller. (For examination purpose, hereinafter it will be interpreted that the steps are performed in the each of the processing units.)"

The applicant respectfully submits Claim 5, as amended, meets the limitations of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, it is not necessary to state whether the steps are performed in the processing units or the controller. The claim should be interpreted as written and no additional limitations should be assumed.

The Examiner stated, "Claim 12, and similarly claims 13-23, recites the limitation 'each projector' in line 4. There is insufficient information to determine whether this refers to 'A projector' in line 1 or one of 'a set of projectors' in line 4."

The applicant respectfully submits Claims 12 and 13-23, as amended clarify what is being claimed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,340,976 to Oguchi *et al.* ("Oguchi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,049 to Nagasaka ("Nagasaka"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 recites, "providing at least two projectors, each having chromaticity data representing a color gamut of that projector stored therein" and "determining a standard color

gamut achievable by each said projector.” Oguchi in view of Nagasaka does not show, teach, or suggest this combination of limitations. Instead, Oguchi measures the colors produced by the displays and Nagasaka adapts the image data to be either shown on a display or printed.

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and U.S. Patent No. 5,287,173 to Onuma *et al.* (“Onuma”). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and U.S. Patent No. 6,453,067 to Morgan *et al.* (“Morgan”). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,272 to Noguchi (“Noguchi”). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka in further view of Japanese Patent Publication JP 02-001351 to Yoshikuni (“Yoshikuni”). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,410 to Appel (“Appel”). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,910 to Sato (“Sato”). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,253,043 to Gibson (“Gibson”).

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the base claim, much less the limitations of the base claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato.

Claim 12 recites, “at least two projectors, each said projector operable to generate a portion of an image; and chromaticity data stored in each said projector; and wherein at least one of said at least two projectors is operable to deliver the chromaticity data to a main controller, to receive color correction data from said main controller, and to calculate pixel values based on said color correction data.”

Oguchi, in view of Nagasaka and Sato does not show, teach, or suggest the combination of limitations recited by Claim 12. In particular, the projectors of Oguchi, Nagasaka, and Sato do

not store chromaticity data, nor do they receive color correction data from a main controller.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato. Claims 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato and further in view of Onuma. Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato and further in view of Morgan. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato and further in view of Gibson.

Claims 13-18 depend from Claim 12 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 12, the prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the base claim, much less the limitations of the base claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato.

Claim 19 recites, "a projector having a processing unit for processing pixel values for image data to be delivered to the spatial light modulator; and wherein each projector stores chromaticity data associated with said projector; and wherein each projector is operable to deliver the chromaticity data to a main controller, to receive color correction data from the main controller, and to calculate pixel values based on the color correction data."

Oguchi, in view of Nagasaka and Sato does not show, teach, or suggest the combination of limitations recited by Claim 19. In particular, the projectors of Oguchi, Nagasaka, and Sato are not "operable to deliver the chromaticity data to a main controller, to receive color correction data from the main controller, and to calculate pixel values based on the color correction data."

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato. Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato and further in view of Onuma. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguchi in view of Nagasaka and Sato and further in view of Gibson.

Claims 20-23 depend from Claim 19 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and

on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 19, the prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the base claim, much less the limitations of the base claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418